

FLOOR SCHEDULE FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 2015

HOUSE MEETS AT:	FIRST VOTE PREDICTED:	LAST VOTE PREDICTED:
10:00 a.m.: Morning Hour 12:00 p.m.: Legislative Business Fifteen "One Minutes"	1:30 – 2:00 p.m.	3:00 – 4:00 p.m.

H.Res. 19 – Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 30 – “Save American Workers Act of 2015” (Rep. Young (IN) – Ways and Means) and H.R. 3 – Keystone XL Pipeline Act (Rep. Cramer – Transportation and Infrastructure) (One Hour of Debate). The Rules committee has recommended one Rule which provides for consideration of 2 bills.

For H.R. 30, the Rules Committee has recommended a closed Rule that provides for one hour of general debate equally divided between the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The Rule allows one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, and waives all points of order against the resolution.

For [H.R. 3](#), the Rules Committee has recommended a closed Rule that provides for one hour of general debate equally divided between the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The Rule allows one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, and waives all points of order against the resolution.

The Rules Committee rejected a motion by Mr. Polis of Colorado to consider H.R. 30 and H.R. 3 under open Rules. **Members are urged to VOTE NO.**

[H.R. 30](#) – “Save American Workers Act of 2015” (Rep. Young (IN) – Ways and Means) (One Hour of Debate). This bill would modify the Affordable Care Act’s (ACA) definition of full-time employee, repealing the 30 hours a week threshold and replacing it with 40 hours a week. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that it would increase the deficit by over \$53 billion over 10 years. Identical legislation passed the House in April. That vote can be found [here](#).

Under the ACA’s employer responsibility provisions, employees who work at least 30 hours per week are defined as full-time and are counted towards the 50-employee threshold for requiring businesses to offer affordable health coverage. Use of a 30 hour threshold in the ACA was designed to minimize the ability of employers to slightly shift hours or engage in other gamesmanship to reduce hours or insurance obligations. According to the non-partisan Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, recent studies provide little evidence that the ACA has created an incentive to significantly shift toward part-time work. Businesses either operate with a substantially part-time work force, or they use mostly full-time workers. Given that approximately 95 percent of businesses with 50 or more full-time workers already offer coverage, most employers will not fully retool their business practices and cut full-time employees who may be working 35 or 40 hours a week or more down to 29 hours just to avoid the coverage requirement.

Since the ACA became law, 10.8 million new jobs have been created in the private sector, and it has not led to a shift to part-time work, despite Republicans’ erroneous claims. In fact, part-time workers as a share of all workers in our economy has fallen since the enactment of health care reform – from 19.7% of all workers in March 2010 to 18.2% today.

By replacing the 30 hour threshold with a 40 hour threshold, employers would become greatly incentivized to “game” the law, putting five times as many workers at risk of having hours cut to avoid employer responsibility requirements. This new “part-time” employee model would completely undermine the intent of the employer responsibility provisions, and, according to the CBO and Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT), it would cause as many as 1 million Americans to lose access to employer provided health coverage and up to 500,000 to become uninsured.

Those that could not afford private coverage would have to rely on federal programs, like Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). This would shift costs from businesses to taxpayers, as spending will increase to support higher enrollment in public programs. The CBO estimates that enactment of this measure would increase the deficit by \$53.2 billion over 10 years, and Republicans have chosen to bring the bill to the Floor without providing an offset.



OFFICE OF DEMOCRATIC WHIP STENY H. HOYER

THE DAILY WHIP

democraticwhip.gov • (202) 225-3130

Positive effects of the Affordable Care Act are already being seen across the country: over ten million previously uninsured Americans now have health insurance, people cannot be denied coverage due to a pre-existing condition, women cannot be charged more for the same insurance policy, and cost growth is at the lowest it has been in 50 years. However, at the start of a new Congress, Republicans are making it once again clear that repealing the Affordable Care Act is their only goal; this attempt marks the 54th time that Republicans have tried to repeal or undermine the law. Lastly, the White House has issued a SAP stating that the President would veto this bill. **Members are urged to VOTE NO.**

Bill Text for H.R. 30:

[PDF Version](#)

TOMORROW'S OUTLOOK

The GOP Leadership has announced the following schedule for Friday, January 9: The House will meet at 9:00 a.m. for legislative business and, pursuant to H.Res. 5, begin the reading of the Constitution. Following the reading, the House is expected to consider H.R. 3 – Keystone XL Pipeline Act (Rep. Cramer – Transportation and Infrastructure).

The Daily Quote

"The House will vote again on Thursday to lengthen Obamacare's full-time workweek definition to 40 hours... The workweek bill affects how many people are covered by the employer mandate, which went into effect Jan. 1 for businesses with 100 or more workers. They have to offer insurance to 70 percent of their full-time workforce this year, or pay penalties. Full time, for this purpose, is 30 hours... CATO Institute scholar Michael Cannon wrote Wednesday that the bill might lighten Obamacare's business burden but drive up government spending by making more people eligible for the health law's subsidies. 'How is that a policy victory?' he writes, adding that it was also wrongheaded strategy... 'This proposed change would actually do a lot of harm, not just to the Affordable Care Act but to a substantial number of workers across the country,' he said."

- Politico, 1/8/2015